

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 13 and 15 through 21 are currently pending in the application.

Claims 4 and 21 have been amended.

Claim 14 has been cancelled.

This amendment is in response to the Office Action of March 14, 2005.

Claim Objections

Claim 4 is objected to due to informalities in the claim language. Appropriate correction has been made.

Claim 14 is objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Appropriate correction has been made.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Anticipation Rejections

Anticipation Rejection Based on Wood et al. (U.S. Patent 6,453,127)

Claims 1 through 5, 7 through 12, and 14 through 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Wood et al. (U.S. Patent 6,453,127) (“Wood”).

Applicant asserts that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.

Verdegaal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)..

The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim.

Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Claim 1 is directed to “[a] method of managing stored print jobs of a printing device, comprising: providing a printing device incorporating a web server, said web server linked to a network; initiating a remote request over said network for a web page from said web server, said web page having at least one applet tag referencing at least one applet thereby; transmitting said web page over said network; downloading and displaying said web page using a web browser; downloading said at least one applet using said web browser in response to downloading said web page, said at least one applet programmed for providing control over data stored in job retention memory of said printing device; and managing said data stored in job retention memory using said at least one applet operating within said web browser.”

Wood does not identically describe each and every element of claim 1 either expressly or inherently to anticipate the claimed invention of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Wood does not identically describe the element of the claimed invention calling for “a printing device incorporating a web server.” In drawing FIG. 2 of Wood described is a web server 32 in a computer 30 and separate from printer 15. Computer 30 is also referred to as web server 30. See Column 4, lines 34-52. Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claims 2 through 5 and 4 through 12 are allowable for at least the reason of depending from an allowable base claim.

Claim 15 is directed to “[a] system for managing stored print jobs of a printing device, comprising: a printing device incorporating a web server, said web server linked to a network, said printing device comprising a job retention memory for storing print jobs sent by network-based devices; at least one workstation for communicating with said network, said at least one workstation having a web browser thereon; and at least one applet accessible by said at least one workstation, said at least one applet for managing stored data in said job retention memory of said printing device through user input on said at least one workstation.”

Wood does not identically describe each and every element of claim 15 either expressly or inherently to anticipate the claimed invention of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Wood does not identically describe the element of the claimed invention calling for “a printing device incorporating a web server.” In drawing FIG. 2 of Wood described is a web server 32 in a computer 30 and separate from printer 15. Computer 30 is also referred to as web server 30. See Column 4, lines 34-52. Therefore, claim 15 is not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claims 16 through 19 are allowable for at least the reason as depending from an allowable base claim.

Claim 20 is directed to “[a] method of managing print jobs stored in job retention memory of a printing device, comprising: providing a printing device incorporating a web server, said web server linked to a network; providing a workstation, said workstation in communication with said network and configured with a java-enabled web browser and a Java Virtual Machine platform; initiating a request over said network for a web page from said web server using said java-enabled web browser, said request initiated by specifying a network address of said web page to said java-enabled web browser, said web page having at least one applet tag referencing at least one applet responsive to said request, transmitting said

web page over said network to said java-enabled web browser; downloading and displaying said web page using said java-enabled web browser; downloading said at least one applet using said java-enabled web browser in response to downloading said web page, said at least one applet programmed to provide control over data stored in job retention memory of said printing device; executing said at least one applet using said Java Virtual Machine platform; and managing said data stored in job retention memory using said at least one applet operating within said web browser.”

Wood does not identically describe each and every element of claim 20 either expressly or inherently to anticipate the claimed invention of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Wood does not identically describe the element of the claimed invention calling for “a printing device incorporating a web server.” In drawing FIG. 2 of Wood described is a web server 32 in a computer 30 and separate from printer 15. Computer 30 is also referred to as web server 30. See Column 4, lines 34-52. Therefore, claim 20 is not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claim 21 is directed to “[a] A method of managing stored print jobs for a printing device having a web server linked to a network, comprising: initiating a remote request over said network for a web page from said web server within said printing device, said web page having at least one applet tag referencing at least one applet; transmitting said web page over said network; displaying said web page using a web browser; downloading said at least one applet in response to downloading said web page, said at least one applet programmed for providing control over data stored in job retention memory of said printing device; and managing said data stored in said job retention memory using said at least one applet.”

Wood does not identically describe each and every element of claim 21 either expressly or inherently to anticipate the claimed invention of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Wood does not identically describe the element of the claimed invention calling for “said web server within said printing device.” In drawing FIG. 2 of Wood described is a web server 32 in a computer 30 and separate from printer 15. Computer 30 is also referred to as web server 30. See Column 4, lines 34-52. Therefore, claim 21 is not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Obviousness Rejections

Obviousness Rejection Based-on-Wood et al. (U.S. Patent 6,453,127)

Claims 6 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

Applicant further asserts that to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the cited prior art reference must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. Furthermore, the suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on Applicant's disclosure.

Claims 6 and 13 are allowable for at least the reason of depending from an allowable base claim.

~~Applicant has carefully considering the cited prior art, the rejections, and the~~
Examiner's comments.

Applicant submits that claims 1 through 13 and 15 through 21 are clearly allowable over the cited prior art.

Applicant requests the allowance of claims 1 through 13 and 15 through 21 and the case passed for issue.

Respectfully submitted,



James R. Duzan
Registration No. 28,393
Attorney for Applicant
TRASKBRITT
P.O. Box 2550
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: June 9, 2005
JRD/dlm:lmh
Document in ProLaw